

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 23, 2006 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 38-57 have been rejected. The Applicant has amended Claims 38, 49, 53-55 and 57. In addition, the Applicant has cancelled claim 56. Further, the Applicant has added new claim 59. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 102

Claims 38, 43-46, 48, and 55-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Reissued Patent No. Re 34,095 to Padula (hereinafter "Padula"). The Applicant respectfully traverses.

Padula discloses a stylus switch which is activated automatically when the tip of the stylus is pressed against a digitizer tablet with sufficient force. The pressure switch includes a transducer in the form of an ink layer having electrical resistance which varies as a function of the pressure applied thereon. Padula also discloses a collapsible dome of metal which provides tactile feedback to the user when the user pushes a predetermined amount of force on the stylus.

However, Padula does not teach an actuator configured to apply a haptic sensation in response to at least one sensor signal indicating the stylus at a designated coordinate position, as in Claim 38. In addition, Padula does not teach applying a force from an actuator to the stylus in response to the coordinate position signal indicating the stylus being at a designated location at the surface, as in Claim 55. Considering that Padula does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element as set forth in Claims 38 and 55, Padula cannot be considered to

anticipate Claims 38 and 55, respectively. For at least these reasons, Claims 38 and 55 are allowable over Padula.

Claims 43-46, 48 and 56-58 have also been rejected in light of Padula. However, Claims 43-46 and 48 are dependent on Independent Claim 38; and Claims 57 and 58 are dependent on Independent Claim 55. As stated above, Claims 38 and 55 are allowable over Padula. Accordingly, Claims 43-46, 48 and 56-58 are allowable for being dependent on allowable base claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 39-41, 47, and 49-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Padula in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,177,472 to Taniishi et al. (hereinafter “Taniishi”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding Independent Claim 49, the Applicant would like to point out that the Office Action contends that Claim 49 is rejected under 35 USC 103, but does not provide a prima facie case of obviousness. In addition, the Office Action does not indicate what Padula lacks in teaching in Claim 49 to warrant an obviousness rejection. Instead, the Office Action appears that Taniishi is used under 35 USC 102 to reject Claim 49 by anticipation. Nonetheless, the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion under either a 102 or 103 rejection.

Taniishi discloses a vibration transmitting plate 8 which is placed over a display, whereby the plate 8 transmits vibrations from a vibrating input pen 3 to three vibration sensors 6 positioned at corner portions of the plate 8. The vibration sensors 6 measure transmission times of the ultrasonic vibrations transmitted from the vibrating input pen 3 to determine the coordinates of the vibrating input pen 3 on the plate 8.

In contrast to the Claim 49, Taniishi does not disclose, teach, hint or otherwise suggest an actuator coupled to the stylus and configured to vibrate in response to the sensor detecting the coordinate position of the stylus at a designated location at the surface. (emphasis added). In fact, Taniishi discloses the opposite of the subject matter recited in Claim 49, because the Taniishi stylus produces the vibration to determine the coordinates of the stylus. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not have the motivation to use Padula or Taniishi, individually or in combination to reach the subject matter claimed in Claim 49.

Regarding Claims 39-41, 47 and 50-54, Claims 39-41 and 47 are dependent on Claim 38; and Claims 50-54 are dependent on Claim 49. Claims 38 and 49 are allowable over Padula and Taniishi for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Claims 39-41, 47 and 50-54 are allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims.

It should be noted, although not raised in the office action, one skilled in the art would have no motivation to combine and/or modify Padula with Taniishi to reach the inventions in Claims 38 and 55. As stated above, Claims 38 and 55 recite, among other things, that the haptic sensation (Claim 38) or force (Claim 55) is in response to the stylus being sensed in a designated location. This is not taught in Taniishi, but in fact, the opposite is described in the Taniishi. For at least these reasons, Claims 38 and 55 are patentable over Padula and Taniishi, individually or in combination.

New Claim

The Applicant has added new Claim 59 to the present application. It should be noted that new claim 59 is fully supported by the specification and no new matter has been added.

Allowance of new claims 59 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: 4/20/06


Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040